



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,570	09/26/2003	Yoshihiro Ohshima	117348	2333
25944	7590	12/10/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/670,570	OHSHIMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-13 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-13 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/25/2008</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final action filed on 8/11/2008.
- Claims 9-13, and 16-22 are now pending in the present application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, filed 8/11/2008, with respect to Ikegami Munemitsu have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore rejection(s) of claim(s) based on Ikegami Munemitsu have been withdrawn.

Applicant's amendments, filed 8/11/2008 have been entered and fully considered. In light of the applicant's amendments, the rejection(s) have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection(s) have been made, and applicant's arguments have been rendered moot.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Previous 112 rejections to claims are withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments.

### ***Examiner Notes***

Examiner cites particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed

invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-13 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Komiya, US 2002/0196452 in view of Minowa et al, US 2003/0020951.

Re claim 9, Komiya discloses an accounting apparatus (see abstract; figures 1, 3, 7, 12-13) for charging for a process for image data, executed in response to a request from a requester (see figures 12-13), wherein the process for the image data includes at least some processing for the image data (see figures 7-8, 10-13), the accounting apparatus comprising: a storing unit (POD server 115, see figure 1, and 3 with text) that stores a first relationship between a condition of the processing (printing condition) and an accounting amount for the condition of the processing (printing condition) (see figures 7-8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 54-81, 85-107); a first accounting amount calculation unit (POD server 115, see figures 1, 3 with text) that calculates a first accounting amount (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 56-81, 85-107) by using the data of the processing received by the receiving unit and the first relationship

(see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 56-81, 85-107); and an accounting unit (see figures 1, 3) that executes a first accounting processing of charging the requester, which has made the request for the image processing, for the calculated first accounting amount (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 56-81, 85-107).

Minowa teaches the process for the image data includes at least a RIP processing for the image data (see paragraphs 146-149); a receiving unit that receives data of the RIP processing (see figure 1 with corresponding text; paragraphs 144-150, note that RIP is performed by printing company 2 and is then send to (received by) management company 3); a storing unit (printing company 2 has storage means, figure 1) that stores a first relationship between a condition of the RIP processing and an accounting amount for the condition of the RIP processing (see paragraphs 29-32, 146-153, 169-178; figures 1-6); a first accounting amount calculation unit (see figures 1-2; paragraphs 29-32) that calculates a first accounting amount by using the data of the RIP processing received by the receiving unit and the first relationship (see paragraphs 29-32, 146-153, 169-178; figures 1-6; claim 1); and an accounting unit (see figures 1-2) that executes a first accounting processing of charging the requester, which has made the request for the image processing, for the calculated first accounting amount (see paragraphs 29-32, 146-153, 170-178; figures 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the image processing system of Komiya to include RIP processing system and techniques of Minowa for the benefit of having a “printing cost

Art Unit: 2625

calculation system that is capable of efficiently and rapidly calculating accurate printing cost" as taught by Minowa at paragraph 10.

Re claim 10, Komiya further discloses a second accounting amount calculation unit (POD server 115, see figures 1, 3 with text) that calculates a second accounting amount for image formation processing of the image data which is processed by the image processing, the image formation processing being a processing which prints an image of a recording medium (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 56-81, 85-107), wherein: the receiving unit receives data of the image formation processing (see figure 1, element 105); the storing unit (POD server 110, see figure 1, and 3 with text) stores a second relationship between a condition of the image formation processing (printing conditions, fig. 7) and an accounting amount for the condition of the image formation processing (see figures 7-8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 54-81, 85-107); the second accounting amount calculation unit (POD server 110, see figures 1, 3 with text) calculates a second accounting amount by using the data of the image formation processing received by the receiving unit and the second relationship (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 37-48, 56-81, 85-107); and the accounting unit (see figures 1, 3 with text) executes a second accounting processing of charging the requestor for calculated second accounting amount (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 56-81, 85-107).

Minowa teaches a second accounting amount calculation unit (see figures 1-2; paragraphs 29-32) that calculates a second accounting amount for image formation processing of the image data which is processed by the RIP processing (see paragraphs 144-153), the image formation processing being a processing which prints

an image of a recording medium (see paragraphs 25-32, 170-175; figures 1-6). Minowa also further teaches the receiving unit receives data of the image formation processing (see printing company 2, figure 1); the storing unit (management company has storage means, figure 1) stores a second relationship between a condition of the image formation processing and an accounting amount for the condition of the image formation processing (see paragraphs 25-32, 169-178; figures 1-6); the second accounting amount calculation unit (see figures 1-2; paragraphs 29-32) calculates a second accounting amount by using the data of the image formation processing received by the receiving unit and the second relationship (see paragraphs 29-32, 146-153, 170-175; figures 1-6; claim 1).

Re claim 11, Komiya further discloses the requester includes a first requester apparatus (see element 101, fig. 1) and a second requester apparatus (see element 105 with 115, fig. 1); and the first accounting amount calculation unit (POD server 115, fig. 1) increases the first accounting amount for the first requester apparatus when the second requester apparatus executes the image processing requested by the first requester apparatus (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 15-16, 56-81, 85-107, note that print shop 113 could be selected for outputting both test and actual print data in figure 10. Furthermore, the accounting amount for the first requester apparatus will increase, if test printing is also desired by the first requestor apparatus in addition to the actual printing).

Re claim 12, Komiya further discloses the requester includes a first requester apparatus (see element 101, fig. 1) and a second requester apparatus (see element

105 with 115, fig.1); and the first accounting amount calculation unit (POD server 115, fig. 1) decreases the first accounting amount for the second requester apparatus when the second requester apparatus executes the image processing requested by the first requester apparatus and then the image processing requested by the second requester apparatus is executed (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 15-16, 56-81, 85-107, note that print shop 113 could be selected for outputting both test and actual print data in figure 10. Furthermore, the accounting amount for the requester apparatus will decrease, if only actual printing and no test printing is desired by the first requestor apparatus, and then second requester apparatus performs the actual printing as requested).

Re claim 13, Komiya further discloses the request for the image processing designates details of the image processing (see figures 7-8, 10-13); and the first accounting amount calculation unit calculates the first accounting amount on the basis of the designated details of the image processing (see figures 7-8, 10-13; paragraphs 56-81, 85-107).

Re claim 16, claim 16 recites identical features, as claim 9, except claim 16 is a method claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 9 are applicable for claim 16.

Re claim 17, claim 17 recites identical features, as claim 11, except claim 17 is a method claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 11 are applicable for claim 17.

Re claims 18-19, claims 18-19 recite identical features, as claims 16-17, except claims 18-19 merely deals with executing the method of claims 16-17 on a computer. Thus, arguments made for claims 16-17 are applicable for claims 18-19.

Re claim 20, Komiya further discloses the first relationship includes a plurality of relationships between a plurality of conditions (see figure 7) of the image processing and a plurality of accounting amounts (see figures 8, 10-13, paragraphs 56-81, 85-107), each of the accounting amounts corresponding to each of the conditions (see figures 8, 10-13, paragraphs 56-81, 85-107).

Minowa teaches the first relationship includes a plurality of relationships between a plurality of conditions (see figure 3) of the RIP processing (see paragraphs 146-149) and a plurality of accounting amounts (see figures 3-5, paragraphs 170-175), each of the accounting amounts corresponding to each of the conditions (see figures 3-5; paragraphs 170-175).

Re claim 21, Komiya further discloses the condition includes at least one of a file size and a number of pages (see figure 7).

Minowa also teaches the condition includes at least one of a file size and a number of pages (see figure 3).

Re claim 22, Komiya further discloses the accounting unit starts to execute the first accounting processing before the image formation processing is executed (see figures 8, 10-13; paragraphs 56-81, 85-107).

Minowa also teaches the accounting unit starts to execute the first accounting processing before the image formation processing is executed (see figures 2-6; paragraphs 25-32, 131-135, 170-178).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571) 270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

*/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625*